

Puget Sound Partnership Science Panel
Meeting Summary

August 6 & 7, 2008
Alderbrook Resort, Union

Day 1 – August 6, 2008

Science Panel Members Present:

- Joel Baker
- Robert Johnston
- Jan Newton
- Timothy Quinn
- Frank Shipley
- John Stark
- Usha Varanasi

Staff:

- Cullen Stephenson, Deputy Director
- Tammy Owings, Special Assistant to the Science Panel
- Scott Redman, Action Agenda Manager
- Martha Neuman, Action Agenda Director
- Jim Cahill, Director of Accountability & Budget
- Mary Ruckelshaus, Puget Sound Partnership Chief Scientist
- Terry Wright, Special Assistant to the Tribes

*It is intended that this summary be used along with notebook materials provided for the meeting.
A full recording of this meeting is retained by PSP as the formal record.*

Action Items:

- Approval of Revised Meeting Schedule
- Approval of April 10, 2008, Conference Call and April 15 & 16, 2008, Meeting Summaries

Meeting Summary:

- Introductions
- Agenda schedule revision
- Overview of recent events

9:00 a.m. WORKSHOP

Science Panel Chair, Joel Baker opened the meeting at 9:05 providing an overview of the agenda.

The morning work session focused on development of the Biennial Science Work Plan (BSWP). At the beginning of this session, Joel noted that he would like the Science Panel to think about what they want in a BSWP as if starting with a blank slate.

The Panel spent the morning discussing the needs for the BSWP and how the first two years will be the capacity-building stage. They talked about how working on both the Strategic Science Plan and the Work Plan at the same time is not ideal but, once both documents are completed, the next round should work better.

The Panel brainstormed ideas on capacity needed and what needs to be in place at the end of the first two years.

The Panel discussed how implementation of the Action Agenda is not the job of the Science Panel but the job of the Ecosystem Coordination Board. But the Science Panel needs to find ways to provide the science behind implementation decisions.

Jan Newton shared the discussion she had with PSP Communications Director Paul Bergman on science-related educational needs of the Partnership:

- Be advocate for science and science training in watersheds to encourage more science degrees,
- Act as a resource to the Partnership staff – a point of contact on the Science Panel to answer science questions,
- Be involved with the educational system concerning science education (K-12 and higher education), and
- Translation of public outreach information (information that goes to general public).

The Panel needs to identify a way to bring existing models together in a coordinated framework (PSNERP, Salmon, climate change, IEA, etc.) and identify any gaps.

CALL REGULAR MEETING TO ORDER – Joel Baker, Chair

Joel Baker opened the regular meeting of the Science Panel at 12:50 p.m. and reviewed the agenda for this meeting.

PANEL BASICS

Approval of the April 10, 2008, Conference Call Summary and April 15 & 16, 2008, Meeting Summary

Tim Quinn **MOVED** approval of the April 10, 2008 Science Panel Conference Call Summary and the April 15 & 16, 2008, Science Panel Meeting Summary. John Stark **SECONDED**. Panel **APPROVED**.

2008 Meeting Schedule Revision

Tim Quinn **MOVED** adoption of the revised 2008 meeting schedule to add two meetings: one on September 16 & 17, 2008, and one on October 7, 2008. John Stark **SECONDED** the motion. Panel **APPROVED**.

2009-2010 Meeting Schedule

Joel reviewed a matrix outlining due dates and options for 2009-2010 meeting dates.

In thinking about the meeting schedule, Panel members would like to include:

- Regular conference calls in addition to the regular meeting dates,
- Receiving the meeting materials on the Wednesday before the Friday calls and a week before the face-to-face meetings to prepare for the meetings, and
- A consistent pattern for the meeting dates, if possible.

The Panel agreed to quarterly face-to-face two-day meetings plus bi-monthly conference calls on the first and third Friday of each month.

The Panel discussed the amount of e-mails and information being received and asked Tammy to send a weekly e-mail update providing all the necessary information.

ACTION AGENDA UPDATE

Martha Neuman provided the Action Agenda update.

She informed the Panel that the Leadership Council has added a November 11 meeting to be able to meet the December 1 approval dead line.

She then reviewed the Action Agenda outline. The Action Agenda will be organized around the four questions:

1. What is a healthy Puget Sound?
2. What is the status of Puget Sound and what are the biggest threats to it?
3. What actions should be taken that will move us from where we are today to a healthy Puget Sound by 2020?
4. Where do we start?

The main document will be fairly short with the larger portion of the document in the appendices.

She gave a status report on several of the pieces of the Action Agenda:

- Topic Forums have been completed and draft papers are currently being reviewed,
- Action Area profiles are out for review,
- The goals listed in the legislation have been approved by the Leadership Council,

- The Panel will discuss indicators more later in the meeting, and
- The World Resource Institute (WRI) interviews have been completed and results are being reviewed currently.

At this meeting, Martha is asking Science Panel feedback on the Guiding Principles used to identify priority actions. The Panel asked for some time to respond because they had just received the information. Martha would like to get the feedback by the August 15 conference call.

Martha reported that she will be updating the statements in the Initial Strategic Priorities paper, but she hasn't had the opportunity to revise since the last Science Panel meeting.

The Panel discussed the needs and expectations for help from the Science Panel in the Action Agenda process.

Martha reported that she will share the gap analysis questions with the Science Panel to see if they are comfortable with them before finalizing. And after the October 22 & 23 Leadership Council meeting, Martha will be asking the Science Panel to review the Action Agenda as a whole. The Panel will need to figure out when to get the review back and may need another conference call.

Martha noted that the Leadership Council meetings may still need to be adjusted, so the October date may change.

She reviewed the list of proposed appendices, highlighting which need Science Panel review and which are Science Panel products.

Joel voiced concern that there may not be enough "action" in the Action Agenda.

Martha responded that "question three," which is being reviewed during this meeting, is for aligning current actions where; where as the "question four" section is where the bold new actions will be highlighted. This will be shared with the Panel at a later date.

Joel wanted to make sure the Leadership Council knows the Science Panel is behind them and supports having them take bold actions.

THREATS AND DRIVERS

Mary Ruckelshaus presented this agenda item. She reported that during the week of August 18 there will be a packet sent to the Science Panel to give them a first opportunity to review the draft threats and drivers information. This document will be used to inform the Action Agenda.

At this meeting Mary reviewed two examples with the Science Panel:

- Habitat alteration – Upland example
- Surface/groundwater - Vulnerability to nitrate example

She walked the group through the DPSIR process for both examples and explained how this would work and how to include it in the Action Agenda.

It was suggested that a full analysis on all the threats and drivers would inform the Action Agenda. Mary explained that this information will be in the final Action Agenda, although they will not be ranked initially. It is not possible to do a formal risk analysis this year, but where there is more information in the Topic Forum papers and synthesis papers, the information will be included in the analysis. After the Action Agenda is in place, a formal risk assessment may be suggested because that will take more time. Parts of the formal assessment should be done in the next year, but the full results won't be available until later.

The Science Panel agrees that a full assessment of the threats and drivers is critical but that it is an ongoing process and will take time.

Bill Ruckelshaus suggested that the Science Panel could help the Action Agenda by laying out a process and timeline for doing a full assessment of the threats and drivers.

The Panel noted how the information that Mary presented fits nicely with the discussion the Panel had during the morning session and how important it is to piece all the parts together.

SCIENCE-RELATED PRIORITIES FOR STATE AGENCIES

Jim Cahill provided the overview for this presentation requesting Science Panel approval to support the state agency proposals.

The Panel asked Jim if this proposal is part of the federal funds and if the Partnership would include a request also including things like research. Jim reported that this is part of the state budget request and that the proposals are for continuing programs or adding to existing programs, not new projects.

Jim would like to have a subcommittee review the proposals so he can provide a prioritized list by first part of September. This list needs to go to both the Governor's Office and to the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO), which needs to provide a list of monitoring efforts. Once again this process is out of sync because we don't have an Action Agenda, Strategic Science Plan, or Biennial Science Plan in place. It will be difficult to make a judgment on whether these requests fit into the process or not. But because this will guide funding for the next couple years, the Partnership needs to

highlight one or two items that would help meet the goals. Jim will provide the decision packets for the proposals to the Panel to help in their review.

The Panel discussed their support for having a RFP process in place to select projects that fit the Strategic Science Plan. Jim discussed development of a hybrid combination of both a RFP process and a prioritized list of recommendations.

The Panel is uncomfortable with highlighting any projects when they don't have details or anything to compare with. Jim noted that the draft Action Agenda should be ready the first part of September and the Panel could use the draft Action Agenda for their review process.

In the future, Joel would like to have a process in place and have an accountability step built in.

BIENNIAL SCIENCE WORK PLAN

Julie Hall reviewed the status of the Biennial Science Work Plan (BSWP) and reviewed what she heard from the Panel during the morning work session.

The Panel discussed additional items they would like to see in the Plan:

- Highlight more new ways of doing things,
- Add a preamble noting that the Partnership's Science Panel is not the only science group in the Sound and include what the added value of the Science Panel is, and
- Include more information and details on the Integrated Ecosystem Assessment (IEA).

Scott Redman will integrate this discussion and revise the paper that Julie drafted this afternoon, adding the last 12 pages of the outline provided in the meeting packet. He will also distribute the list of recommendations under the different categories.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Herb Pearce, President of EcoTech and President of the Clean Technology Alliance, discussed and provided a demonstration of his product, which he noted removes oil from water. He invited the Puget Sound Partnership to join the alliance to get access to the technologies he and others on the alliance can provide.

Ken Morse, Net Septic, talked about the technologies provided by his company and how this product can be used in remediation practices. He reported the reasonable cost and ease for retrofitting as two positive qualities of his technology.

Tom Mumford, Department of Natural Resources (DNR), talked about capacity. He always asks what an individual needs to answer a question so he would suggest the Science Panel look more at the social and economical side of things. He stressed the need to put develop a peer review process now. Concerning the state agency budgets, he doesn't believe everything that the agencies are working on made it to the list. The two activities on the list from DNR are legislatively mandated.

Joel talked about an article he read on green budgeting. He will provide this article to the Science Panel. He noted that the Panel is currently peer reviewing the Topic Forum papers and that the Panel needs to include a peer review process in the BSWP.

Heather Trim, People for Puget Sound, provided a paper from the environmental caucus on environmental indicators. She went over the paper.

Bob Johnston thought this was a good way to lay the issues out but would like to see the costs included.

Heather noted that would be included later.

Jacques White, People for Puget Sound, representative on the ECB, noted there has been a significant effort on nearshore called CHIPS (Coastal Habitats in Puget Sound). He sent the report to some of the Panel members and would appreciate if it could be forwarded to the rest of the members.

There was written comment from Doug Myers in the meeting packet. Doug had requested these comments be included in the public comment period for the July 21 Workshop. The Panel discussed whether to accept public comment after the fact.

The Panel discussed the process for taking comment, noting that people are provided time during the meeting agenda to comment and those comments would be included in the meeting summary. When people send in written comments, the comments will be included in the meeting packet but will not be read into the record or mentioned in the meeting summary. If the Panel starts getting a lot of written comment, Tammy will archive on the SharePoint site and send a summary of comments to the Panel weekly. Panel **APPROVED** this process.

5:20 p.m. RECESS FOR THE EVENING

Puget Sound Partnership Science Panel
Meeting Summary

August 6 & 7, 2008
Alderbrook Resort, Union

Day 2 – August 7, 2008

Science Panel Members Present:

- Joel Baker
- Robert Johnston
- Jan Newton
- Timothy Quinn
- Frank Shipley
- John Stark
- Usha Varanasi

Leadership Council Members Present:

- Bill Ruckelshaus
- Bill Wilkerson
- Dan O'Neal
- Diana Gale

Staff:

- Cullen Stephenson, Deputy Director
- Scott Redman, Action Agenda Manager
- Tammy Owings, Special Assistant to the Science Panel
- Terry Wright, Special Assistant to the Tribes

8:36 a.m. RECONVENED MEETING – Joel Baker, Chair

Joel welcomed everyone and asked for introductions.

He then reviewed the agenda and provided an overview of the meeting day.

MONITORING

Joel introduced this subject and gave an overview of the three presentations under this agenda item.

Status and Trends Monitoring Design

Steve Ralph and Scott Redman presented this portion of the agenda.

Scott explained the on-going work framing the monitoring needs for inclusion in the BSWP and for creating a coordinated monitoring plan within the next two years.

This section is the path toward developing a water resource integrity-monitoring program for Puget Sound.

Steve provided an update on the work he has completed since the last time he presented. At this meeting he would like concurrence on the approach and assessment questions he is proposing.

Next steps:

- Decipher Action Agenda and link to monitoring objectives
- Engage scientists in defining assessment questions, hypotheses, data needs/data sources and appropriate indicators
- Sort by themes but ensure cross-linkages
- Identify means to accomplish this
- Consult with Science Panel at key steps in the process

Scott reported that on the second bullet, he has talked to Karen Dinicola with the Monitoring Consortium and the Consortium is helping with this. A report will be out for review shortly.

Tim Quinn asked when the Leadership Council will be brought into this process. Scott believed they would start working with the Leadership Council as early as January 2009.

Usha Varanasi is concerned with the June 2010 date for the pilot and would encourage an earlier goal date. Monitoring is key for so much of the Action Agenda and we need to get this in place sooner.

Scott took credit for the June 2010 date but appreciates Usha's comments and asked Steve to talk through some alternatives to it.

Steve noted that a straw proposal could be created by a smaller group of individuals instead of using the larger buy-in process. Could also be dealt with through an outreach process.

Frank Shipley wouldn't want to see the speeding up of the process without getting the hypothesis – maybe start the process earlier with a draft version of the Action Agenda, which could save some time.

Bill Ruckelshaus urged the need for a monitoring plan. He would like some monitoring system in place when the Action Agenda comes out. He stressed the need to have a way to evaluate if we are making process. He would like the process with which we can

start tracking Action Agenda progress to be in a format that, when final, the earlier process won't need to be thrown out. He wants the final product to be right, but noted the need to start using something sooner.

The Panel discussed options for monitoring and ways to move this forward faster. Scott felt this was a good conversation for him to be able to move the monitoring efforts forward. Scott will work with Steve to find a way to move the June 2010 date up. Joel would also like to see more integration between the Action Agenda and adaptive management framework.

Combining Databases for Ecosystem Monitoring

Scott Hitchcock, Scott Boetcher, and Erica Brittany provided this presentation.

This presentation provided an update on where they are with a Web-based monitoring inventory project.

Erica provided an update on the inventories and gaps identified. The next step will be to look for existing monitoring programs to fill these gaps or inform the Partnership on missing monitoring programs.

Scott B pointed out a link to the gap analysis on their Web site.

Scott H provided a walk through of the monitoring inventory database Web site.

Scott B noted that when looking at the monitoring gaps, they will need to use the indicators to link the two. They will also be integrating Julie Hall's work and working with agencies with existing databases to link and pull the data.

Joel is concerned with how to maintain this database.

Scott B believes that there are ways to encourage people to contribute and keep information updated in this system.

Jan talked about NANOOS and how they are doing the same type work; the two should work together. Jan will talk with Erica on how to do this.

Scott R talked to the monitoring group recently and asked for a staff level workgroup to start looking at this work.

Monitoring Forum

Bill Wilkerson provided an update on the work of the Monitoring Forum.

He was discouraged with Steve Ralph's presentation with a 2010 pilot start date. Work has been done and this project should be able to be started. We know that we don't

have a perfect system and we need to work on this, but if we don't start showing progress money won't be allocated for monitoring projects. The Science Panel needs to move monitoring forward and connect with Action Agenda efforts. Need to have a system set up for the longer term. We don't have a system and policymakers know that. It is up to the Partnership and Leadership Council to build a system for monitoring and up to the scientists to make sure we build the right system. He is confident we can do this. We have a lot of resources in place; now we need to make them work.

Joel agrees that we really need to link the monitoring efforts to the Action Agenda. Adaptive management needs to be in place to help make the Action Agenda work. He feels that we are making progress so is not as frustrated as he was a few months ago.

ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS

Tracy Collier reviewed the handouts on the indicators noting that 75% of the species indicators have been reviewed. Evaluations have been completed for all available water quality, human health, water quantity, and habitat indicators.

Today's charge to the Science Panel is to decide what indicators to put forward to the Leadership Council.

Usha discussed the need to make sure the indicators that are chosen are funded or will be funded. She would suggest taking a draft version of the Action Agenda to look at the indicators so that we can make sure those indicators are funded and not have to do the work twice.

There is some confusion on the indicators and what they are needed for. The indicators are to be used to see if we are making progress toward the goals.

Management indicators are yet to be identified and these will be identified after the Action Agenda is in place.

The environmental indicators are what we are looking at today and these are the indicators that look at the health of Puget Sound.

On August 28, Joel, Tim, and Frank will join members of the Leadership Council and some key staff for a subcommittee meeting on indicators.

It was suggested that the Panel endorse the full list of indicators at this time then work toward a more refined list once the Action Agenda is in place.

Frank Shipley **MOVED** endorsement of the full list. Tim Quinn **SECONDED**.

Panel Discussion:

The Panel discussed additional work needed to get the final list of indicators and that the current list of prequalified indicators is good (although we may find need for additional indicators). This list will go out for additional review and comment. The Leadership Council and other Partnership groups will also need to define what indicators they want to use for communication purposes.

The group was reminded that the human well-being indicators are following a separate track and Trina Wellman is working on these indicators. She may use some time during the subcommittee meeting on the 28th to first present these indicators, as the same Leadership Council members are on this work group.

The ECB will be discussing indicators and benchmarks at their August 22 meeting.

The species and biodiversity indicators group will be scheduling a meeting of a subgroup to work with Mary R on that list of preliminary indicators.

The Panel **APPROVED** endorsement of the full list of preliminary indicators with the understanding that this is not the final list.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Constance Ibsen, citizen, co-chair Lower Hood Canal Watershed Coalition, and WRIA 16 PU Member stressed the importance of monitoring. She just found out that Twanoh beach has been closed. She wants a monitoring program that is ongoing. She came back up later in the public comment session to talk about oyster testing and how important science is for the people.

Dick Bergeron, Chimicum Grange and WRIA 17 steering committee, is heartened by the Science Panel and wary of the Leadership Council and its political leaning. He is concerned when he hears that everyone in Puget Sound will be sharing in the cost to clean up Puget Sound. He talked about the need for public outreach to let people know what the Partnership is doing and what the public can do to help Puget Sound. He has heard the need to get the info into K-12 – he doesn't want to add any more to the education system.

Teri King, Hood Canal Action Area Representative, thanked the Panel for having the meeting in this Action Area and welcomed them back at any time.

Jan appreciates Teri's work as an ECB member and making sure the local people are informed.

Doug Myers, People for Puget Sound, is concerned about not having real monitoring in place. He suggested that the monitoring inventory have a way to attach the actual reports in the system.

ADJOURN REGULAR MEETING SESSION

The regular meeting was adjourned at 11:15 a.m. The Panel then went into a work session on the Strategic Science Plan.

WORKSESSION ON STRATEGIC SCIENCE PLAN

The Panel reviewed the schedule for the rest of this year. Joel noted the need to have meetings every other month for the next couple years.

The Panel talked about the subcommittee meeting scheduled for August 28:

- Bob will work with Partnership staff to lay out the indicator work early next week
- The Science Panel will discuss at 11:00 a.m. on August 15
- On 28th the Science Panel subgroup will meet with a subgroup of the Leadership Council
- Outcomes from this meeting will then be taken forward to the whole Leadership Council at the September meeting

The Panel talked about the need for a dictionary of terminology - Tim and Mary Beth Brown will work on this.

Scott would like feedback on Steve Ralph's July 18 memo concerning sequencing of questions by next Friday, August 15. Scott will send the questions and memo to the Panel again.

Karen Dinicola came forward to discuss the Monitoring Consortium's questions and cross-walk exercise. There was a long discussion on monitoring and indicator needs and work.

Strategic Science Plan Assignments:

The Panel reviewed the latest version of the Strategic Science Plan schedule and assignments. The goal is to have a reviewable draft by the September Science Panel meeting.

Biennial Science Work Plan (BSWP) Assignments:

Scott reviewed the newest version of the BSWP.

Joel noted the tight timeline and how the Panel will not be able to get to the details that we would all like but will need to go with information available and take our best guess when needed.

The group talked about the budget system. Cullen explained the different processes and how POG works.

The general direction and decision is for the Science Panel to put forward support for any items they believe should continue for this budget session.

The Panel decided to spend a few minutes going over the BSWP document then to split into two breakout groups (Capacity and Projects) for about an hour to brainstorm needs. The Panel will then come back together for the last hour of the Work Session.

Capacity Breakout Team

- Jan Newton
- Tim Quinn
- John Stark

Project Breakout Team

- Joel Baker
- Frank Shipley
- Bob Johnston

The Panel reconvened at 3:45 p.m. and provided an overview of each team's discussions.

The Panel discussed how the monitoring program as it currently exists does not meet the needs of the Puget Sound Partnership or the Science Panel. For this program to work, there is a need for augmentation of some parts and expansion of others.

Scott provided three options needing augmentation in monitoring:

Ambient/pressures

- Continue PSAMP and other monitoring
- Augmenting performance management system with more information about ecosystem conditions from Phase 1 indicator work and to support ecosystem modeling

Effectiveness:

- Continue intensively monitored watersheds
- Continue other effectiveness monitoring

Program level:

- Develop comprehensive monitoring program
- Puget Sound Monitoring Consortium (2 or 3 parts continuing, monitoring development, stormwater work group, and possibly governance)

The Panel needs to write a clear statement of existing programs that they value continuing.

Joel reviewed the projects that the projects subgroup identified and who could work on the follow up.


Scott noted the EPA funds and how if the projects are ready for funding then we could possibly go ahead with them using the EPA funds. The IEA, Peer Review, and other projects that have been brought up in the past six months need to also be included in the Plan.

Next steps:

- Scott will send the current version of the Plan out today including Karen's notes
- He will give the Science Panel a few days to review
- Science Panel will get comments to Scott by the 15th
- Scott will incorporate the comments and revise by 19th

4:18 p.m. ADJOURN

Science Panel Approval



Joel Baker, Science Panel Chair

3/12/09

Date

Next Meeting: September 16 & 17, 2008
UW Tacoma Campus